Dear Michel, 8/4/79

Under date of July 23 your secretary sent me what she had forgotten earlier, a copy of the CBC receipt sign by Sally Turner.

This does not describe the print of the Zapruder film I loaned you so it does not establish that you gave that print to CBC.

In dragging all of this out two things are conspicuous - you write what is self-serving and not true and you have failed to deny letting Mark Lane have the excellent print I loaned you. (I know that prior to this he had a poor prints, one out of focus, and made and sold super-8 copies of it.)

In working my down through a large accumulation on my desk I came accross your letter of March 14, 1979, which I had not filed. (I presume I responded.) In it there is a classic example of the self-serving intended to create a false record - to deceive others: "But I really think it would have been much better sending these films directly to you, than through a third party."

Then why did you not do this? You were supposed to make a copy and make a prompt return of my film. You didn't. I wrote you repeatedly asking for its return. You did not even bother to respond. A long period of time went past. The only reason I asked CBC, which had asked to borrow the same film, to get it from you is because I could not get to France to do it for myself. By then it was clear from your violation of your word and your refusal to respond to my letters that there was no other means available to me.

With the passing of time and new official dishonesties, like those of the House assassinations committee, the value of so fine a print has increased considerably, however one evaluates value. This is one damage to me. Another is not having the use of the film (and conversely its availability to a comeptitor, the value of whose public appearances is enhanced by it). Still another is the great amount of time merely recovering it is requiring, with all the upset your evasive and less than honest letters cause.

This is a rotten way to treat an aging and ill man who has undertaken a large and unpaid public work and who took considerable time in an effort to help you, including trusting you with a valuable property because you represented an agency of the French Government and carried the endoresment of the USIA.

Whatever the situation may be, and I have no reason not to believe that what CBC returned is other than what you gave it, none of this would exist and I'd not have been put to all this trouble if you had kept your word and then when you didn't if you had responded properly when I wrote you. Or, the situation and the damage to me is entirely of your doing - 100% your responsibility.

When you return from Ceylon I expect one of two things from you: the return of my original Zapruder print and something in return for all the time you have wasted for me or an assurance of payment for the cost of the best possible replacement I can now obtain, again with an allowance for my trouble and extra costs.

Much as I dislike what can be scandalous this business of pointless letters has to come to an end, in court if I have no other choice. This will also involve your government and mine, another matter I dislike, but if there remains no choice there is nothing I can do about it. I have tried to be patient to avoid what can be unpleasant all around. I suggest that if you are not aware of the costs of litigation you make inquiry because I am certain you will find that the cost of litigating will exceed the cost of replacing my original as best it can now be replaced - if you do not recover it and return it.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg